

CHARGE OF DISCRIMINATION

This form is affected by the Privacy Act of 1974. See enclosed Privacy Act Statement and other information before completing this form.

Charge Presented To: Agency(ies) Charge No(s):



FEPA

440-2024-07303



EEOC

Illinois Department Of Human Rights

and EEOC

State or local Agency, if any

Name (indicate Mr., Ms., Mrs.)

Mr. Syed Raza

Home Phone (Incl. Area Code)

312-493-4843

Date of Birth

03/27/1965

Street Address

9550 140th Ct. Apt. 412

City, State and ZIP Code

Orland Park, IL 60462

Named is the Employer, Labor Organization, Employment Agency, Apprenticeship Committee, or State or Local Government Agency That I Believe Discriminated Against Me or Others. (If more than two, list under PARTICULARS below.)

Name

Accenture

No. Employees, Members

1000+

Phone No. (Include Area Code)

312-693-5009

Street Address

500 W Madison St.

City, State and ZIP Code

Chicago, IL 60661

Name

No. Employees, Members

Phone No. (Include Area Code)

Street Address

City, State and ZIP Code

DISCRIMINATION BASED ON (Check appropriate box(es).)

☐ RACE ☐ COLOR ☒ SEX ☐ RELIGION ☐ NATIONAL ORIGIN
☒ RETALIATION ☐ AGE ☐ DISABILITY ☐ OTHER (Specify below.)

DATE(S) DISCRIMINATION TOOK PLACE
Earliest Latest

11/13/2023

☐ CONTINUING ACTION

THE PARTICULARS ARE (If additional paper is needed, attach extra sheet(s)):

Please see attached for Particulars

I want this charge filed with both the EEOC and the State or local Agency, if any. I will advise the agencies if I change my address or phone number and I will cooperate fully with them in the processing of my charge in accordance with their procedures.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the above is true and correct.

4.16.24

Date



Channin Parv Sinnaturo

NOTARY - When necessary for State and Local Agency Requirements

I swear or affirm that I have read the above charge and that it is true to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

SIGNATURE OF COMPLAINANT

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME THIS DATE
(month, day, year)

EXHIBIT A

I believe Accenture (“Respondent”) has discriminated against me based on my gender (male) and retaliated against me in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (“Title VII”) in that:

I began working for Respondent in May 2013 as a Senior Manager with Accenture’s Applied Intelligence practice. I joined Respondent with 20 years’ experience in consulting and corporate roles.

In 2019 I moved from the Analytics Group to the Organizational Analytics practice.

I consistently received positive performance reviews and feedback. My direct personal sales for 2018/2019 totaled approximately \$20M, and my practice’s attributed sales exceeded \$150M. In my FY 21-22 performance feedback, Andy Young, Managing Director, noted that I was “...one of the best business-focused data and analytics people we have...and a great leader within our business, operating at a Managing Director level.”

In 2019, Julie Sweet became CEO of Respondent. Shortly after she stepped into the new role, Ms. Sweet publicly announced that one of her goals was to achieve gender parity at Respondent by 2025. I believe this is an admirable goal, however, the way in which some of Respondent’s leaders have implemented this mandate has resulted in discrimination against male employees, me included.

From 2019 to 2023, I submitted my case for promotion to Managing Director and was denied every year. In the meantime, female employees with less experience and sometimes even with performance and/or conduct issues were promoted to managing director ahead of me.

For example, in or around July/August of 2020, I was the one of the first at Respondent to write a paper on Organizational Strategies to navigate the post-pandemic future of work and the related areas of governance and people management. I shared this paper across Respondent globally, developed a comprehensive client offering, led client discussions and proposals in North America and Europe, trained the Firm’s Managing Directors on the practices, and the paper became the standard reference document internally on this topic. By March 2021, Ms. Sweet and her leadership team had reviewed this document and reached out to ask who could coach them on this topic. I was not selected for this, and I was not selected to lead the client offering either. Instead of choosing me for the lead role, the leadership team asked two women who had not contributed to the client offering and solution development as I had. I was never credited for this work and did not receive any sales attribution or credits in MMS (Respondent’s tracking system for individual sales credits).

I began to raise concerns about the impact the gender parity initiative was having on my career and client service. I shared my concerns in detail during conversations with my career advisors and in employee surveys from 2020-2023. In or around December 2021 I had a conversation with Senior Managing Director, Andrea di Pietro who told me that I could not expect to be promoted anytime soon as Respondent’s parity targets required a certain number of female candidates to be promoted to Managing Director. I said that I felt this approach was discriminatory and he agreed with me but indicated there was nothing he could do. In or around

EXHIBIT A

December 2022, I had a similar conversation with my career advisor, Senior Managing Director, Scott Pharr. He too agreed with me that this approach was discriminatory but did nothing about it.

In June 2023, I proposed a T&O offering to build and lead a practice in the areas of Strategic Workforce Planning, Future Work Transformation and Organizational Risk. Through my extensive client work over several years, I had built strategic solutions, client credibility and intellectual property in these areas. Despite the fact that my practice leader and career advisor were supportive of my proposal, leadership did not support me leading it. In July 2023, the T&O Group hired Stephanie Fox (female) as a Managing Director and offered her the lead role for this practice area despite her having almost no experience in relevant areas.

On November 13, I was terminated as part of an alleged “cost restructuring plan.” I was confused as to why I had been selected given my positive performance and asked for more detail about the reason I was chosen. My career advisor and HR leads did not have a response to my question other than to say they did not understand why. To my knowledge, in my practice area I was the only director terminated as part of this alleged cost-savings. Moreover, I believe overall the restructuring adversely impacted men versus women. I was told later by my practice area lead, Mr. Tim Gobran, I was selected for termination because I did not grow the business enough – but that was clearly not true. As discussed above, I proposed several ways to grow the business but the opportunities I created with client proven solutions were given to women and they received credit for them. On November 15, I spoke with Mr. Gobran about my termination and told him that I felt I was selected because of Respondent’s gender parity goal. In response, Mr. Gobran shared that he had also experienced some of the same discrimination in the last few years.

I believe that I was selected for termination because I am a man, which is an action prompted by the aggressive target set by Julie Sweet for gender parity by 2025. Since this target was announced publicly, managers at the Respondent have taken questionable and sometimes drastic steps to progress towards this goal, notwithstanding the discriminatory outcomes, and damaging impact on careers and livelihoods of individuals such as myself. Furthermore, I believe that my termination was in retaliation for bringing up concerns of gender discrimination.